NPIC/TDS/D-1081-67
17 October 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR FILE

SUBJECT: [redacted] Processor Acceptance

1. On 3 October 1967 [redacted] visited [redacted] for the purpose of acceptance testing the [redacted] processor and sent [redacted] for subsequent test and evaluation. The processor was previously checked out [redacted] and, after a number of minor adjustments to the air drier compartment, performed very well, processing and drying all [redacted] recommended film types [redacted]. As the result of this check-out, the processor was shipped [redacted] was unable to immediately install the equipment, due to other instrumentation in the test area at the time. It was installed sometime around 11 September 1967, with a [redacted] representative on hand (it was later disclosed that the [redacted] representative left immediately after installation without processing any film thru the machine). Between the installation date and 3 October 1967 several phone conversations [redacted] the technical monitor were held regarding progress on the installation and the date for acceptance testing. When NPIC representatives arrived on 3 October, the machine discrepancies and performance were discussed. This was the first disclosure that the machine was not operating as it had at the [redacted] plant [redacted] personnel had been attempting to process film for two weeks prior to the visit with the machine definately out of adjustment. The impingement air in the dryer section was creating film flutter and banging the film against the top of the dryer entrance slot. [redacted] engineers stated they had tried all recommended adjustments to alleviate the problem, had called [redacted] for further recommendations, and had even taken the dryer section completely apart, cleaned it, readjusted and reinstalled it to no avail.

2. The NPIC representatives then went down to see the machine in operation and to observe the aforementioned film damage problem.

25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

Declass Review by
NIMA/DOD

The following deficiencies, in addition to film damage at the dryer were observed:

a. Replenishment system inadequate for sensitometric testing (demand system). The system varies from 1 to 3 quarts of developer during the processing of 500 feet of film.

b. Foam build-up apparent in the wash section.

25X1 c. [redacted] would not dry thoroughly.

d. Positive pressure caused back-up of oxidized developer.

e. Speed control table (conversion chart) of little value - tachometer still required to determine film speed.

3. The technical representative immediately called [redacted] to inform them that acceptance had not been accomplished and that an [redacted] engineer should be sent in to immediately correct the problems. This was verbally agreed to [redacted] on 9 October 1967 and made all the possible adjustments on the instrument. This resulted in a reduction but not elimination of the film damage and somewhat better drying characteristics than before. However, nothing was accomplished on dryer modification, replenishment system, over pressure, foaming wash tank, etc.

25X1 25X1 25X1

4. On 11 October 1967 a call was made [redacted] informed in detail of the processor deficiencies. His reaction was one of concern, since part of his job is follow-up on R&D efforts for possible commercial application. Since the processing principle used [redacted] is unique, [redacted] is looking toward possibly making a shipboard type processor of the same type [redacted] assured me [redacted] would discuss all the problems and let me know of their decision on how to aleviate them.

25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

5. Since this was a Fixed Price contract, all the contract funding has been spent plus an estimated [redacted] of the contractor's money. I called [redacted] and advised him of the situation and to hold up any outstanding billings and contract balance. This he agreed to do. He will also get on them regarding their lack of progress reports.

25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

6. [redacted] called the technical monitor on 13 October 1967 and told him they had decided, if we would ship the machine back to [redacted] to go over all the deficiencies, modify where necessary, and make

25X1 25X1

sure we were fully satisfied with the machine. I told him, since the contract was completely out of funds, that I would attempt to send it back under a GBL.

25X1

[redacted]

25X1

7. Future testing of the [redacted] Processor [redacted] after completion of the rework, will probably be dependent upon the funding left in the T & M contract, since the Chip Printer and Chip Processor will have arrived for testing during the rework phase.

25X1

[redacted]

25X1

[redacted]

Distribution:
Original - File
1 - Originator
2 - NPIC/TDS/DS